

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 48-52 are pending in this application, Claims 41-47 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 48-52 having been currently added. Support for new Claims 48-52 can be found in the original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed.<sup>1</sup> No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 41, 46, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Tiao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,318,863; hereinafter “Tiao”); and Claims 42-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tiao in view of Li (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,269; hereinafter “Li”).

In regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a), Applicants have canceled Claims 41-47, rendering the present rejections moot. However, Applicants note that new independent Claim 48 includes features from original Claims 40 and 45. Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 48 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 48 is directed to an illumination arrangement, including:

...a solid state light source;

a light collecting, integrating and re-directing device configured to receive at least a part of emitted light from said solid state light source and to re-direct said received light, said light collecting, integrating and re-directing device includes a hollow light pipe with a light incidence aperture, which is positioned in close proximity of a light exit aperture of said solid state light source, and an end section of said hollow light pipe in close proximity of said light incidence aperture is filled with a plain light pipe.

---

<sup>1</sup> See original Claims 40, 42, 43, and 45; Figures 31B, 32A, and 32B; and page 25, line 32 to page 26, line 2; page 26, lines 4-34; and page 40, lines 3-14 of the specification.

Thus, the illumination arrangement of Claim 48 includes an end section of a hollow light pipe is filled with a plain light pipe in order to improve the coupling efficiency from a solid state light source to a light collecting, integrating and re-directing device.

Page 7 of the outstanding Office Action, in the rejection of former Claim 45, asserts that Figures 1 and 5 of Li shows:

...said light integration device (20, 50) is or comprises a hollow light pipe (col. 4, ln. 25) having a light incidence aperture (input of 20 and 50), wherein said light incidence aperture of said light integrating device (20, 50) is positioned in a neighborhood of a light exit aperture (fig. 5) of said light source device (120) or of said light mixing devices (30) and wherein a second or end section in the neighborhood of said light incidence aperture (input of 20 and 50) and/or being terminated by said light incidence aperture (input of 20 and 50) is - in particular completely - filled with a plain light pipe section (20 or 50), in particular for matching the respective refraction indices (col. 4, ln. 30-33; wherein the examiner interprets 20 and 50 could be made from the same material).

Column 4, lines 22-33 of Li merely describes that the input waveguide 20 and the output waveguide 50 may be single core optic fibers, fused bundles of optic fibers fiber bundles, solid or hollow square or rectangular light pipes, or homogenizers. Applicants respectfully submit that assuming *arguendo* that input waveguide 20 and output waveguide 50 of Li could be made from the same material, Li still does not describe that a plain light pipe is inserted in a hollow light pipe, as recited in independent Claim 48.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Li fails to teach or suggest "said light collecting, integrating and re-directing device includes a hollow light pipe with a light incidence aperture, which is positioned in close proximity of a light exit aperture of said solid state light source, and an end section of said hollow light pipe in close proximity of said light incidence aperture is filled with a plain light pipe," as recited in Claim 48. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Tiao fails to cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Li.

Independent Claim 51 is directed to a method for manufacturing an illumination arrangement including, *inter alia*:

...positioning a hollow light pipe on top/around a solid state light source;

depositing a droplet of index matching glue on the solid state light source;

inserting a plain light pipe into the hollow light pipe;

pressing the plain light pipe against the solid state light source; and

curing the glue.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 48, Li does not describe a plain light pipe inserted in a hollow light pipe, and thus Li fails to teach or suggest "inserting a plain light pipe into the hollow light pipe," as in Claim 51. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 51 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguishes over Li and Tiao.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 08/09)

Derek P. Benke  
Registration No. 56,944